

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Geary Thomas Dooly,)	Case No. 7:22-cv-01734-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Nicholas Niles Spears, Jr.; William)	
Stork; Johnson and Freeman, LLC;)	
Brock and Scott, PLLC; Does 1–5,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's pro se complaint.¹ ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On July 20, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be summarily dismissed without issuance and service of process. ECF No. 21. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the second Report and the time to do so has lapsed.

¹ Plaintiff paid the full filing fee. ECF No. 16.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. This action is **DISMISSED** without issuance of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

October 4, 2022
Spartanburg, South Carolina